)¢ MARCH 20, 1950

New Republic

COMMUNIST CHINA AND THE U. N.

By BRUCE BLIVEN

AMERICAN EDUCATION AND AMERICAN LIFE

By WILLIAM HEARD KILPATRICK

BURNHAM'S WAR ON THE SOVIETS

By DAVID SPITZ

McCARTHY'S GREAT RED SCARE:

AN EDITORIAL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ATOMIC ENERGY...
World Control or World Catastrophe?

U. S. atom control policy is changing. After years of following a see-no-evil, hear-no-evil and speak-no-evil line, most top government officials now concede that the world's No. 1 problem can best be solved through international discussion and control.

Perhaps you remember the *New Republic's* editorial, "A Proposal for Atomic Peace," which appeared last November. With this piece, the *New Republic*, long America's liberal spokesman on vital issues, took the lead in proposing major changes in the Baruch plan.

Now, at the urgent request of many leaders of thought and action in America, the *New Republic* will print four important articles, written by the editors, which examine atomic energy *completely*—from A-Bomb to H-Bomb. These articles, soon to appear in forthcoming issues, review and discuss the ABC's of atomic physics . . . military and industrial uses of atomic energy . . . the history of international negotiation for control . . . and make specific suggestions for a workable control plan.

Other important subjects scheduled for discussion in forthcoming issues

- ★ 1950 U. S. Election Prospects
- ★ Social Security Extension
- ★ Americans for Democratic Action —A Progress Report
- ★ The Role of the Near East
- ★ Samuel Gompers—and the AFL Today
- ★ Segregation in Education
- ★ Immigration Policy

All America will soon be talking and thinking about these vital articles.

Early newsstand sellouts of the Atom Control issues are inevitable. So—to be sure of getting your copies—fill out the subscription form below and return it today.

The *New Republic* makes a wonderful gift for friends who share your interest in current affairs. And your thoughtfulness will be appreciated even more if you enter your gift subscriptions now—to include the Atom Control Issues.

HANDY ORDER FORM

TEAR HERE

The NEW REPUBLIC • **40 East 49 Street** • **New York 17, N. Y.**

Yes, please enter my subscription to the *New Republic* (to include the Atom Control issues) as checked below:

☐ 1 Year (52 issues) $6.50

☐ 6 Months (26 issues) $3.25

Name_____

Address_____

City_____ Zone___ State_____

In addition, please enter a gift subscription (including Atom Control issues) as indicated:

☐ 1 Year $6.50 ☐ 6 Months $3.25

Gift for_____

Address_____

City_____ Zone___ State_____

Gift card to read from_____

I enclose $_____ or ☐ Bill me later.

(Please list additional gifts on separate sheet.)

Foreign and Canadian Postage $1.00 per year extra.

8/20/50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR MARCH 20, 1950

5 McCarthy's Great Red Scare: An Editorial
7 The Week:
7 Rent Control's Last Gasp
7 Franco's Booster
8 Trial Marriage
8 The Shipkov Case
8 Mr. Secretary, Take Note
8 Herblock Cartoon
9 Outside America
10 Real-Estate Road Show by Jean Begeman
11 Communist China and the UN by Bruce Bliven
12 American Education by William Heard Kilpatrick
17 Harold L. Ickes
18 Books:
18 Burnham's War on the Soviets by David Spitz
19 Who Runs the South? by Helen Fuller
20 Pasternak's Poetry Reviewed by Marc Slonim
20 Criticism of Yeats Reviewed by Donald A. Stauffer
21 Music
22 Movies

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

MANAGING EDITOR: Jack Weeks

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

FOREIGN AFFAIRS EDITOR: Percy Winner

WASHINGTON BUREAU: Helen Fuller, (Political Editor), Jean Begeman

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY EDITING: Elizabeth Huling (Chief), Ruth Tarcov

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1950, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N.Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

SEWELL AVERY, chairman of US Gypsum as well as Montgomery Ward, believes like Moscow that the American economy is headed for collapse. According to *Newsweek*, he told the US Gypsum stockholders' annual meeting he has salted away $55 million, a third of the company's assets, in cash and government bonds, instead of putting it to work in business. He is ready for the depression that has followed, he says, every war in history.

Soviet Russia is basing its policy, too, on the inevitability of American collapse. Will it come? It will if we let it. For the first time in history we know enough to prevent its coming. Moscow and Sewell Avery are betting we won't apply what we know.

The number of unemployed is highest since the war but should go down shortly. The last Keyserling Economic Advisors' report underlined what the big worry is: corporations are putting emphasis on maintaining high prices, not high volume. The basic steel industry is boosting prices when fact-finders say it should cut them. Congress is trying to shore up farm prices beyond reason. Everyone wants prices reduced; that is, by the other man.

Congress has reached its decisive stage. Spadework has been finished on the big measures on whose success the session depends. Social-security extension, middle-income housing, DPs, federal aid for education, and taxes soon face crucial tests. The session is in its third month and practically nothing so far has passed. Truman can't stump the country this fall with a negative record even though he can blame the GOP-Dixiecrat opposition. The Administration desperately wants something positive passed soon that it can boast about.

Herbert Hoover, prim, pink and plump, was testifying for one of his executive streamlining bills last week. He planted his electric-hearing device firmly on the table a yard before him and talked freely. He looks happier and more relaxed. His exile is over. He is really trying to save taxpayers' money and has Truman's blessing. He looks benevolent and has quiet dignity. He no longer sports that famous starched, three-inch Hoover collar that used to cut him off from all the rest of humanity.

Hoover was followed at once by Controller General Lindsay Warren, who denounced the Hoover plan for streamlining the General Accounting Office. The Civil Service Commission condemns the Hoover scheme to end duplication in civil-service procedure. The American Legion throws fits at Hoover plans to squeeze some of the inefficiency out of the monstrous Veterans' Administration. The full Hoover program might save a billion or two. Here again everybody favors reform—for the other fellow.

The Great What-Is-It of 1950 is taking shape behind closed doors. It is a fantastic fiscal phenomenon. In a month it will be front-page news. For the first time in history the House Appropriations Committee is not going to report out a disconnected series of separate money bills but will offer one super-colossal, consolidated lump-sum bill for all government appropriations of around $40 billion. The object is to give the nation the whole picture at once of what government costs, also to scare the living daylights out of Congressmen who would like to add a few additional billion-dollar porkbarrel features.

Just about the time Chairman Cannon gets this financial Cardiff Giant out on the stage, the House Ways and Means Committee will be offering tax-cut proposals. Somewhere the converging courses of these two measures will hit and go bang. Everybody would like to have excise taxes cut, but the Cardiff Giant will be there, grinning down malevolently, reminding Congress of big costs and deficits. This is going to be a show to reserve seats for now.

Last week the House rejected the CARE book bill and the library-on-wheels bill to aid state education fa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cilities. Federal expenditures "have got to be cut somewhere," said Representative Wadsworth (R, N. Y.). But while these few million dollars were being saved the Senate rejected the genuine economy drive of Senator Douglas (D, Ill.) to bring over-generous federal leave down to a single month and save hundreds of millions, and the House prepared to give veterans extravagant new preference in Post Office employment: another major drain on the taxpayers.

The old Gayety burlesque theatre in Washington last week went "legitimate." After two years the capital has live drama again. It means Actors' Equity has found a means to do away with racial segregation, the issue which caused the theatrical famine. Those who know the bawdy old Gayety, a kind of Mae West among theatres, find something delightfully cockeyed about the family trade now streaming to it to see a fine play. Negroes, diplomats, Republicans, anybody can buy tickets. The theatre has a new coat of paint and a new dignity. A tiny salient of prejudice and bigotry has been nipped off. When "respectable" and conservative agencies falter with the torch of Democracy, America still has the power—thank God—to produce earthy new instruments, like the Gayety, from strange and unexpected quarters.

Notes. Glen Taylor (D, Idaho), up for reëlection this fall, doesn't mention he was Wallace's running mate in his Congressional Directory biographical sketch. . . . Looks like a red-hot fight over public v. private power when the newly signed Canadian treaty for the Niagara Falls development reaches the Senate; Truman favors public power. . . . Acheson's California speech-making tour is a new attempt to "sell" him and the Administration foreign policy to the public; Truman is willing to do everything, apparently, save make a fireside talk himself. . . . Hitherto the FBI has gathered evidence on subversives, somebody else has evaluated it. In the Smith amendment to the National Science Foundation bill the FBI would not only gather police data but have policy-power to evaluate it and disqualify science students. . . . It should be stopped at all costs.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

"Smear-By-Congress"

SIR: I was extremely interested in the article by Richard H. Paul and Philip Mandel, "A Remedy for Smear-By-Congress," in the *New Republic* for February 27. An effective means of precluding such Congressional tactics, without abrogating the reasonable privileges of Congressional immunity, is surely necessary.

Paul and Mandel have overlooked one thing, however, and it is crucial. They suggest "making the government liable, under the present laws of libel and slander, for defamations committed by Congressmen in the course of their official activities." They point out that such liability already exists upon contracts and torts. But the members of Congress are not, constitutionally, national officers. The national government does not appoint them, and they are not elected on a nationwide basis. It is, therefore, unreasonable to expect the Department of Justice to answer for their statements, or for the Treasury Department to pay damages for their libels. What, for example, if a Republican Congressman made a statement of libel? Would a Democratic Administration be expected to bail him out? Not only would the particular Congressman not be a member of the national government, but he would not even be a member of the same political party.

As an alternative, I should suggest that the political party of the Congressman be held liable for the libelous statements of its members. This would provide a source of retribution for damages, which is clearly necessary. It would place responsibility somewhat closer to the original source. And it would, at the same time, serve to increase party responsibility of the members of Congress.

Boston, Mass. ROBERT S. SMITH

SIR: Messrs. Paul and Mandel have suggested a "remedy" for Congressional smears and libels, but it is hardly a just remedy. Assuming that the legal action contemplated is successful . . . who will pay the bill, including court costs? Not the government, since it has nothing of its own, is not in business for profit, and has no earnings of any kind. The taxpayers will compensate the injured plaintiff—and he is himself a taxpayer and will thus paradoxically contribute a few cents to the sum in question. . . .

Permit me to suggest, instead, another partial remedy. . . . Let the "doctrine of legislative immunity" be amended to allow such libel suits *upon the expiration* of the service of the defendants. Not all members of Congress are repeatedly reëlected. Some retire, and some suffer defeat, after one, two or three terms. The knowledge that libel suits might be instituted against them by the victims of their malice and folly would operate as a deterrent in many instances.

This remedy is not satisfactory, either, but it is at least fair to the taxpayers. . . .

La Jolla, Calif. VICTOR S. YARROS

The Lodge Amendment

SIR: I was surprised to see your support of the proposed constitutional amendment to divide the electoral votes of the states in proportion to the popular vote in each state (T. R. B., February 13). This amendment is useless to cure the undemocratic character of the Electoral College and positively bad in addition in view of the present character of the most controversial issues. The Electoral College is undemocratic for two reasons. It gravely distorts the representation in favor of the smaller states [and] no penalty is suffered in their electoral vote by states which . . . deprive their citizens of the right or desire to vote. The proposed amendment would remedy neither of these evils. The only real remedy is by direct popular election of the President.

The proposed amendment is positively bad because it would reduce the key importance of Negro and Jewish voters who favor civil-rights legislation and are centered in the big Northern and Western states, where the Presidential vote is normally fairly close. That is the reason for the enthusiastic support of the amendment by the Southern reactionaries. If adopted, its inevitable effect would be greatly to strengthen reaction in the Democratic Party and indirectly, since that is the dominant party, in the country as a whole.

New York City ALFRED BAKER LEWIS

SIR: Mr. Lewis raises the orthodox argument against the Lodge amendment. It is a strong argument. It is so strong that Charles La Follette and James Loeb of the ADA, and others, disagree with Senator Hubert Humphrey and a majority of liberals who favor it. The amendment, they argue, doesn't go far enough; reduces the minority balance of power in pivotal states; threatens temporarily to enhance Southern power.

We have weighed these arguments and support the Lodge amendment. It goes as far as is possible at this time (probably farther; it is doubtful if the House will pass even the present bill). We recognize the temporary advantage it is likely to give the South. But it is a long step in the right direction. We believe that it is an untenable position to oppose a general reform because it disadvantages a particular pressure group ("Negro and Jewish voters") in a specific locality. We feel that the ADA, for example, will endanger its moral position (as it did in its brief flirtation with Eisenhower) if it puts opportunism before principle. . . .

Washington, D. C. T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 122, NUMBER 12, ISSUE 1842, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 20, 1950 **New Republic**

McCARTHY'S GREAT RED SCARE

AT A CRITICAL MOMENT in world history Senator Joseph McCarthy charges that our State Department and our foreign policies are directed by our adversary, Soviet Russia.

The State Department, McCarthy asserts, has been "taken over" by a "group of twisted-thinking intellectuals." President Truman is their "prisoner." So is Secretary Acheson, "this pompous diplomat in striped pants with a phony British accent." These intellectuals, whom McCarthy numbers at various times as "over 200," "57" and "81," are "card-carrying Communists," sympathetic to, or part of, "an espionage ring." The State Department loyalty board, created to screen out Communists, is, according to McCarthy, either criminally negligent or itself Communist-dominated. (Its chairman is a New Hampshire Republican, General Conrad Snow.) The Communist agents, McCarthy adds, are well entrenched in the intelligence division, "a noted spot for Communists," from where they are able to block investigations and gain access to all secrets. They dominate the personnel department, through which they are able to place other Communists in the highest positions. In this way they are able to dominate the policy-making divisions of the State Department. Of the Voice of America division McCarthy says: "The easiest way to get in is to be a well-known Communist. . . . Unless one has a Communistic background one cannot qualify for a position with the Voice of America." Last, McCarthy charges that in order to conceal these facts from Congress, the top officials of State are falsifying the records and threatening to discharge any loyal official who dares to tell the truth.

What is the truth?

Five years ago, when James F. Byrnes was Secretary of State, the Grand Alliance began to break up and America became security-conscious for the first time. The FBI and the State Department's own security division reviewed the cases of all Department officials suspected of being a little Left of the extreme Right.

In each case, according to its custom, the FBI shoveled into the files every scrap of information it picked up, from proved facts to hysterical charges, ignorant guesses, malicious gossip and rumors subsequently found to be without foundation. It neither evaluated this material nor gave any indication of its reliability. The data contained everything from facts about espionage and counter-espionage, to minute details concerning the sexual habits, the marital troubles, the financial worries and the psychiatric problems of State Department officials, which if exposed to the tabloid press would subject these public servants to intolerable ridicule and abuse.

Even those who defend these sloppy and shameless methods of gathering information on government officials do so only on the understanding that material so gathered is held in absolute secrecy. The right and the duty of the Executive to protect its information has been stressed from the days of George Washington's first Presidential term. The 80th Congress, however, demanded disclosure as the price of granting the State Department its appropriations. And Secretary Marshall, in a moment of naïve weakness, allowed the staff of the House Appropriations Committee to come down from Capitol Hill and plunder the Department's secret files. The committee staff concerned itself with the officials whose loyalty had been questioned. It ignored the favorable comments on these officials and the final evaluations and recommendations of the Department's investigating committees. It carried back to Congress scurrilous charges it could use as a club with which to beat the State Department.

These charges were fully aired on the floor of Congress in the 1947 debates. They were brought out again in 1948 and in 1949. It is a measure of the decline in our common sense and respect for human dignity that in those days they caused little stir.

Meanwhile the government reorganized its loyalty procedures. The President issued his loyalty order on March 21, 1947, requiring FBI checks for all government officials. In the State Department an intensive checking system was created. New applicants for jobs were screened through FBI checks, FBI field investigations, State Department field investigations, and full evaluation and reviews. State Department employees and officials were subjected to exhaustive and continuous checks, ending in the State Department loyalty and security board and, if necessary, in the President's loyalty board. Sixteen thousand employees were investigated. All doubtful cases were reviewed, including those noted by the Appropriations Committee. Not one was found to be disloyal. Two were dismissed as security risks;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

202 resigned whose suitability had been questioned for personal reasons, such as homosexuality, which, at least to this magazine, seem to be none of the business either of the State Department or of Congress.

If the State Department was weak on security matters it was weak in the days of Byrnes and Marshall. Even then, the great majority of security questions raised concerned officials transferred to the State Department from the OWI, organized and directed by Major General William J. Donovan. The steps that were taken, following Acheson's return, led the House Appropriations Committee to declare the matter closed. The contents of the files leaked out, however, to the Un-American Activities Committee, to the Chicago *Tribune*, to a notorious crackpot called Joe Kamp. Eventually they leaked all the way to Senator McCarthy.

McCarthy began his political career as a trial judge in Wisconsin. He presided over the case of a dairy combine and was reprimanded by the Wisconsin Supreme Court for his arbitrary and arrogant action in suppressing evidence and in falsifying the court record. Twice he was exposed for income-tax evasions. When he ran for the Senate in 1946, he refused to resign from the bench, subjecting those who opposed him to the danger of retaliation from his court, if he should lose. Again the State Supreme Court rebuked him, ruling that his action "was in violation of the terms of the Constitution and laws of the state of Wisconsin," that he "violated his oath as a circuit judge and as an attorney at law" and that he was "guilty of an infraction of the moral code."

Now, once again, McCarthy is suppressing evidence, distorting evidence, manufacturing evidence and misleading the Senate and the public concerning the sources of his evidence.

McCarthy's latest charge is that there are 57 card-holding Communists in the State Department. He has not yet named one. In the four cases in which he has given names he has refrained from making the libelous charge of Communism in public; he made it under cloak of Congressional immunity while crying out that he would rather resign than misuse the privileges that Congressional immunity extends.

In all four of these cases McCarthy's charges have been completely exploded. McCarthy denies that he even knows the names of the 81 additional cases he has described. Most of the cases, however, are those of officials questioned in the 1947 check, and cleared then and many times since in continuing loyalty reviews.

McCarthy's charges in these cases range from espionage to homosexuality, membership in labor unions, "incompetence," conceit, mental illness, and acquaintance with radicals. While most of his political charges could cover any anti-fascist of the thirties, many of these cases are identifiable. In every case where charges of disloyalty are involved they have long since been investigated and completely disproved, as one short telephone call could have established.

One case which illustrates McCarthy's reckless disregard of truth concerns an outstanding foreign-service officer to whom a lifelong injustice has already been done by Congress and the FBI. His name is John Stewart Service. McCarthy attacks him and uses him to smear Acheson. He states:

> John Service was picked up by the FBI for turning over to the Communists secret State Department information. Strangely, however, he was never prosecuted. However, Joseph Grew, the Under Secretary of State who insisted on his prosecution, was forced to resign. Two days after Grew's successor, Dean Acheson, took over as Under Secretary, John Service . . . who had . . . urged that Communism was the best hope of China, was not only reinstated but promoted. And finally, under Acheson, placed in charge of all placements and promotions.

Every charge in this statement of McCarthy's is false or misleading. Service never urged that Communism was the best hope for China. He was completely cleared by a grand jury of all charges made against him. Grew was not forced to resign and he did not insist on prosecuting Service. On the contrary, he publicly apologized to Service for his detention by the FBI and commended him as a loyal and outstanding public servant. Acheson had nothing to do with Service's promotion. He was raised two grades by Secretary Byrnes in recognition of his ability and of the injustice done to him. He was transferred to the personnel office and at no time was in charge of placements or promotions. He is one of the leading American experts on Asia. Yet his reputation and his value to this country have been sacrificed for the sake of a cheap political smear.

In clear violation of Constitutional practice established over the life of our republic, the Senate "directed" the President to turn over the State Department files. Clearly McCarthy and his friends gambled that the President would stand on Constitutional practice and refuse. In demanding the files, McCarthy warned the President that "failure on your part will label the Democratic Party as being the bedfellow of international Communism." This "failure" was clearly McCarthy's fondest hope. By the Senate action Truman was forced to undermine the executive power in order to refute McCarthy.

The President's action may well expose McCarthy. But the damage done by his charges will long remain. Those who have been attacked, and many more, may return to the security of private employment, since their position under a new administration has been made insecure. Far more important, tremendous pressure is placed on every government official to conform, to think and to write for the record, to take the safe point of view.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many times, on Indo-China, on Japan, on atomic energy, the safe approach may be disastrous for our national interest. The daring approach, that may seem to coincide with Soviet policy, may be our salvation. Who in government will speak for such an approach while the McCarthys rant and roar?

To citizens far from Washington all this may seem unimportant. It is not. It affects the lives of every one of us. There is no automatic calculating machine in government which eats up undigested intelligence and grinds out new and decisive ideas like the Marshall Plan and the Point Four program. These ideas are born in human minds unfettered by fear of persecution. They take shape in the clash of many different approaches and points of view. The Western world is suffocating now from the lack of new ideas. If we destroy in government the power to generate new ideas by reducing it to one flat level of unimaginative conformity, then we destroy the hope of peace and our own chances of survival.

We cannot lift the cloak of Congressional immunity which gives men like McCarthy the right to disregard laws passed for the protection of citizens, and permits any slander spoken in Congress to be repeated with immunity throughout the press. We cannot even persuade Congress to acknowledge its responsibility for self-discipline, which alone justifies the privilege of immunity. We can, however, convince politicians and the press that the persecution of public servants behind the refuge of Congressional immunity does not pay. Beyond this our sole recourse lies with the voters. We hope that the voters of Wisconsin, conscious of the proud political tradition that has been theirs in the past, will realize the shame they have brought on their state and their government and restore their good name in 1952.

THE WEEK

RENT CONTROL'S LAST GASP

There was almost no open fight when this year's deficiency-appropriation bill, cutting the funds of the Federal Rent Administrator to a minimum, came to the Senate floor for debate. The Senators spent only a couple of hours in polite wrangling over the amount. Harry Cain (R, Wash.), spokesman for the landlord lobby, propped up a multicolored map in front of the Senators to show that most of the country was decontrolled already.

The Administration's original request for $3.6 million to finance control boards for the remainder of this fiscal year had been cut by the Senate Appropriations Committee to $2.6, to be used only "for terminal leave of employees." Senator O'Mahoney (D, Wyo.) attempted to amend the appropriation to allow the Housing Expediter to use the $2.6 million for operating expenses until June 30. Cain offered a "compromise": use the $2.6 million for terminal leave and add $1.4 million to continue operations until June. By a vote of 44-28, the Cain-O'Mahoney compromise was accepted. It was just what the Republicans and the real-estate lobby wanted. Housing Expediter Tighe Woods will be compelled to cut his staff and, even if rent control is extended another year, enforcement will be so weakened by that time as to be virtually ineffective.

Senators Ives (R, N. Y.), Lehman (D-L, N. Y.) and Douglas (D, Ill.) agreed to the amendment with the understanding that the Housing Expediter could ask for more funds when the bill to extend rent control another year is taken up in the Senate. Hearings on that measure are scheduled before the Banking and Currency subcommittee, headed by Senator John Sparkman (D, Ala.), late in April. Sparkman had promised a floor fight on the deficiency appropriation, but he, as well as most of the Senators who had been the strongest advocates of controls in the past, stayed off the floor for the greater part of the afternoon. There was no question about who was running the show. In the gallery reserved for the Senators' families and friends, sat Herbert Nelson, of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and his colleague, Calvin Snyder, of NAREB's Washington Realtors' Committee. During the debate, Cain's executive assistant motioned for them to come down to the Senate cloakroom—a rare privilege, even for a lobbyist.

Those states which have highly populated cities still under federal control would be wise to enact "stand-by" laws such as those now being considered by New York and New Jersey legislatures. Unless Congress restores the cut in the new rent bill, which seems unlikely at this point, the Housing Administrator will be operating with a skeleton staff and only half the needed funds.

FRANCO'S BOOSTER

Senator Owen Brewster (R, Me.), who has long been Congressional spokesman for Pan-American Airways and a great booster for the oil companies' side in a tidelands controversy, has added another "cause" to his list. Recently Washington, D. C., society pages were full of a booster dinner honoring the Spanish Ambassador-at-large, José Felix Lequerica. The Mayflower Hotel's private dining room was decorated in crimson and yellow. "Mrs. Brewster wore the national colors of Spain, a red lace gown and a corsage of rare yellow orchids fluted in red," wrote columnist Marie McNair, of the Washington *Post*. ". . . The main course was the Spanish dish *arroz con pollo Español*. . . ."

The guest list is a good indication of Congressional support for recognition of Franco Spain: Senators Pat McCarran (R, Nev.), Alexander Wiley (R, Wis.), George Malone (R, Nev.), Joseph McCarthy (R, Wis.), and Representatives Joe Martin (R, Mass.), Harold Cooley (D, S. C.), Noble Gregory (D, Ky.),

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eugene Keogh (D, N. Y.), Ralph Church (R, Ill.), Carroll Kearns (R, Pa.) and William Green Jr. (D, Pa.) The press was represented by Mrs. Maxwell Peter Miller, niece of Colonel Robert R. McCormick and editor of the Washington *Times-Herald*, and Mrs. Randolph (Austine) Hearst.

TRIAL MARRIAGE

The philosophers of the Dixiecrat movement have agreed upon a strategy for 1952 which could easily cost a Truman ticket twice as many electoral votes as were lost down South in 1948.

It calls for "a trial marriage at the top" between the Republicans and the States' Rights Democrats. The Dixiecrats would meet in a party convention as they did in 1948, but instead of naming candidates of their own, would simply say "me too." In this way, Southern conservatives who gag at the name "Republican" could vote for the GOP candidates for President and Vice President on a "Democratic" ticket.

Prominently involved in the new plot are: four Alabamians—Gessner McCorvey, Democratic State Chairman; Marion Rushton, Democratic National Committeeman until expelled; Frank Dixon, former Governor of the state, and Charles Wallace Collins, the lawyer-writer who claims to have been the original architect of the '48 anti-Truman "revolt"—and Governor Fielding Wright of Mississippi.

When Ohio's Senator John Bricker suggested a merger of the GOP and Southerners in a new party months ago, most responsible Republicans professed horror at the idea. Turn their backs on the principles of Abraham Lincoln for a mess of Southern votes? Never! This week the GOP's highest officer, National Chairman Guy Gabrielson, confessed to New York *Times* reporter W. H. Lawrence that he has personally been meeting with Dixiecrat leaders on their proposition. No actual merger is contemplated for '52, just "trial marriage," but as one of those involved in the negotiations remarked: "If we were successful in 1952, and worked together with these people for four years, something else might grow out of it."

THE SHIPKOV CASE

Last week we discussed the case of Michael Shipkov, former Bulgarian employee of the American legation in Sofia. When our issue went to press, nothing had been heard of Shipkov for six weeks, and we supported the surmise of the US State Department that he was probably dead or awaiting execution in a Bulgarian prison. We were wrong: a few days later, he and four other Hungarians were tried in a Hungarian court for espionage; all confessed, and were given sentences ranging downward from 15 years.

Shipkov had been arrested last August; he was released a few days later, and thereupon returned to the American legation. He then wrote a detailed report on how he had been tortured by the Bulgarian secret police until he signed a "confession" that he had been spying for the Americans, and agreed in future to spy for Hungary. He remained in the American legation until late in January, when he tried to flee across the Turkish frontier and was captured by the Hungarians.

Last week, Shipkov stood up in court and repudiated his earlier written statement that he had been tortured into a false confession of spying for the Americans. He followed the now familiar pattern of abject admission of guilt. In America, both Secretary of State Acheson and Donald R. Heath, former US Minister at Sofia, denied there was any shadow of truth in this latest "confession" and called Shipkov another martyr to the inhuman methods used in Communist courts to wring admissions of guilt from the innocent. It is a judgment which, we believe, responsible world opinion will confirm.

THE WASHINGTON POST

H-FOR-HYSTERIA BOMB

MR. SECRETARY, TAKE NOTE

The Kwakiutl Indians who live around Vancouver Island have their own way of waging war. They don't drop bombs or shed blood or anything like that. When one island tribe declares war on another it just paddles over with its canoes loaded down with gifts. Its orator leaps ashore and makes a stirring speech about the generosity of his chief. The local orator replies, in accordance with sacred custom, expressing his chief's profoundest thanks. Then the aggressor tribe dumps all its gifts ashore—50 blankets, 20 goats, 10 barrels of dried fish, and so on—and paddles off home well satisfied. Within six months the tribe it has attacked must give back just twice as many gifts in return.

Recently our trade unions have been waging the same kind of war. First Phil Murray gave his enemy John Lewis half a million dollars to help win the coal strike. Naturally the miners concluded that if the time had come to accept gifts from the Steelworkers their chief must have brought the UMW close to ruin. Now Lewis, with the coal strike behind him, has opened war, in turn, on Walter Reuther by offering to lend the UAW a million dollars to wage the Chrysler strike. Reuther was put on a terrible spot by Lewis' apparent generosity. If this method of fighting works so well for the Kwakiutls and the unions, why shouldn't it work against the Russians too? Maybe it's the way to win the Cold War.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUTSIDE AMERICA

Some Europeans found a bit more than President Truman intended in his remark to Arthur Krock of the New York *Times* that "there isn't a drop of Marxist or Socialist blood" in him. The phrase was of course a figure of speech. Still, Europeans who haven't a Marxist or Socialist thought in their heads wondered if the President and his policy-makers weren't beginning to show signs of relying rather more on thinking with the blood than with the brains.

For there didn't seem to be clear thinking behind another of the President's remarks to Krock: "The real trouble with the Russians is that they are still suffering from a complex of fear and inferiority where we are concerned." From the European viewpoint, the "still" puts that judgment in the stream of emotionally colored thinking. Americans may *feel* that the Russian problem is no different now from what it was in 1946 when American atomic policy was fixed, or in 1947 when the Cold War got under way, or in 1948 when the Marshall Plan took shape, or even in 1949 when containment became military through the Atlantic Pact and MAP.

Europeans *think* otherwise. Despite Truman's serenity, they think there are now more frightened men in Washington than in Moscow. If, therefore, the Americans—in 1950 as in 1933—have fear to fear, it isn't that of the Russians but—again as in 1933—their own. The jargon of psychiatry may have relevance to the doubts and guilts stirred up among Americans by the H-bomb; it hasn't to the pact between Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, nor to the decline of Atlanticism in Europe, nor to the general withering away of American prestige throughout the Western world, nor to the fact that no single element of American policy—ECA, blockade of the East, Atlantic Pact, MAP—can any longer be counted a complete success.

It doesn't seem to Europeans that the Russians feel inferior or that their policies are being made by feelings of any kind. They use emotion as an instrument, one of the most important in the arsenal of a diplomacy as total as modern war. They preach peace because no word, no hope, no dream, makes men think more with their blood; they ride the waves of fear rolled up by American talk of war. But the Marxist jargon, which they prefer to the Freudian, doesn't interfere with their ice-cold thinking about what Secretary Acheson calls the existing situation of fact.

The trouble with the Americans, as the Europeans see it, is that their world policy isn't a world policy at all. Marx and Engels said the bourgeoisie confused its interests with the interests of society as a whole; and Europeans who don't agree with Marx and Engels believe now that America is confusing a narrow, insular, parochial concept of its own national interests with the interests of the whole free world. The participation that has replaced isolation as the basis of US policy is really a projection of US views and values. Worse still, these values tend to be of the past.

It isn't merely that American policy doesn't take into account the effects—material and moral, political and psychological, human and military—of the weapons of war its own science, technique and industry have made. It's that Washington seems still to think of Stalin as another Hitler, and that the strategists of the Pentagon seem to think that methods which let the British beat Napoleon are good enough for the Americans against Stalin.

When Napoleon abdicated the British didn't have a single soldier on European soil. After Napoleon came back from Elba, the British furnished only one-twentieth of the allied forces. In the final Waterloo campaign, the British made up less than one-seventh of the forces. The British won by political power: control of the Grand Alliance, and by economic and maritime power: control of the seas.

A year ago, perhaps even six months ago, this might have set a pattern for the present. America dominated the Atlantic alliance. The price of American economic help was (in part) a blockade of the Soviet world. Atom bombs and planes to deliver them gave America control of the air.

Today the pattern no longer applies. America can no longer copy the British strategy which was copied from the ancient Roman methods against Greece, Carthage and Macedonia. Yet American policy still acts as if the mastery of the air could be regained by the H-bomb, though all the evidence is against such a hope; it acts as if the trade blockade were working (which it isn't), as if the Atlantic alliance under Washington's domination were dependable (which it isn't), as if America could win a war against the Russians without using huge armies of infantry of its own.

Nevertheless, European criticism of American policy isn't merely blind and sterile. There are many Europeans who think Washington's policy need not remain insular and out of date. They find the Acheson Doctrine of the Missing Component vastly better than the Truman Doctrine. But the concept of the missing component will be useful, they believe, only if the Americans are willing to find out and accept what is really missing, both in what they have to offer and in what they are willing to join. The existing situation of fact is an absurd formula if Philip Jessup, after a few days in Indo-China, announces on behalf of the State Department that Bao Dai really represents the people of the Viet Nam. It isn't true. Europeans know it isn't true. The English, who—more than any other people in the West—are willing to give the Americans the benefit of the doubt in foreign policy, are alienated by such an official American version of "existing" and of "fact." For they know the facts of Indo-China as they really are from honest reporting in the Manchester *Guardian*, in the *New Statesman*, and also from the conservative *Times* and *Observer*.

Europeans, whose history has made them understand military necessity and military expediency, are unable to find clear thinking and worthy leadership in a policy of visceral wish-fulfillment parading as reasonable realism. Above all, they believe, Acheson's notion of areas of strength can be useful only if the Americans come to understand the true meaning of strength in the dynamics of the modern world. Hence, the start of a new American policy should be the strength to see things as they are. PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REAL-ESTATE ROAD SHOW

by Jean Begeman

WHEN the 81st Congress passed the Federal Housing Act of 1949, setting up a national six-year program for low-rent public housing, the real-estate lobby shifted its emphasis from the nation's capital to the nation's communities. Since the Act requires local approval for all public-housing or slum-clearance projects using federal assistance, the localities have actual power to carry it out or kill it.

Local builders, contractors, hotel and apartment-house owners are banding together to force city councils to reject federal assistance for public housing. When that tactic fails, they draw up petitions calling for a referendum on the question in the hope that so few pro-public housers will turn out in the special election that its enemies can easily defeat it. In spite of these attacks, the public-housing program is well under way. But the real-estate interests opened a new drive last month to repeal the Housing Act. The National Association of Home Builders, meeting in Chicago, announced a campaign to raise immediately "more than $100,000" for a public-relations program to stop public-housing projects "at the local level."

The Home Builders' star performer at the convention was Ward H. Blackall, former president of the Michigan Home Builders Association, who told how a Grand Rapids builders group decisively won two referenda battles over the establishment of a public-housing authority in that city. "We weren't afraid," he said, "to tell the voters of our town that we were selfish about this question of public housing. . . . We were against it because we didn't think it was right, but we were also against it because it was hurting our pocketbooks, and we said so."

The Milwaukee *Journal* (February 23, 1950) reported that local Home Builders representatives brought back from the Chicago convention complete "kits" which "included suggested advertising material, cartoons, explanations of the Federal Housing Act, and the claims that opponents of public housing may expect to encounter and the answers they should give in reply." The Milwaukee Builders Association, undeterred by its failure to force a referendum at the spring election, is now planning a huge campaign to obtain a "vote of the people" at the general fall election on November 7.

The real-estate lobby tried its new tactics first. There, the proposal to establish a local public-housing authority was voted down in a referendum held in July, 1949, soon after Congress passed the Act. But the boast by real-estate dealers that "38 *principal* cities refused to embark upon public-housing programs" is inaccurate. Only six localities have taken formal action against concrete program proposals. The building lobby points with pride to St. Petersburg, Florida, where the owners of slum property teamed up with the local real-estate board and private builders to defeat the program. The City Council and the Mayor openly opposed the federal program and referred the matter to voters in a referendum. St. Petersburg, with a population of about 50,000, rejected the proposal by a margin of 576 votes. Only 17.5 percent of the qualified voters cast ballots. The only other referendum thus far on the low-rent program was held in Waco, Texas, on January 31 and pro-public housers won by 1,241 votes.

In five other localities, city councils or other governing bodies yielded to the real-estate lobbies and voted down the housing program without a referendum: Lincoln, Nebraska; South Bend, Indiana (tie vote 4-4); San Luis Obispo, California; Winslow, Arizona; and Los Angeles County (although Los Angeles City, a separate jurisdiction, is proceeding with a 10,000-unit program).

Even after a community has received its preliminary loan, the projects may be delayed by other tactics. In Oakland, California, a recall campaign was started against city officials who had favored public-housing projects. Last August, residents of West Oakland were startled by sound trucks driving slowly through the streets with an ominous message: "Your homes will be torn down! The Oakland City Council is voting on a socialized housing project! Come to the Council meeting at the City Hall tomorrow night and protect your homes!" Several thousand showed up and the meeting had to be shifted to the Oakland Auditorium, where representatives of the AFL, CIO, NAACP and the American Institute of Architects told the citizens that no homes would be torn down, that several thousand new public-housing units would be built, that there would be no increase in taxes. The Council subsequently voted, five to four, to bring federal housing to Oakland. Two months later the sound trucks were at work again: "Protect your homes! Sign petitions to recall the councilmen who voted for socialized housing! Prevent your homes from being torn down!" Worried residents signed petitions and on February 28 voted in an election to recall three councilmen who had approved the program. Two of the councilmen were returned to office; one lost by about 70 votes and will have another chance in a run-off election on March 14.

The Baltimore Plan is the realtors' favorite alternative to public housing. It is the scheme for renovating dilapidated houses, adding toilets, running water, and plugging up the worst holes to make them acceptable to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

developing. Democracy in general, and the great social problems at home and abroad in particular—these two together define the character traits that need to be developed. At home we have such problems as recurring economic depressions, the just distribution of income, the proper relations of management and labor, and democratic human relations on the basis of respect for personality as such; in the world at large we have the great problems which come to our country as the most powerful leader among the nations today: strengthening the UN, abolishing war, working out a satisfactory relationship with the USSR. It is such problems as these that define the appropriate attitudes, habits, skills, knowledge and creative intelligence which education must develop from childhood on through the whole formative period. If character building constitutes the process aim of education, these traits constitute the social-moral aims for guiding that process.

So many conflicting assertions have been made for and against "progressive education" that we can well give prominence to the topic. In the conflict over "progressive education" we see a life-and-death struggle between a new and an old outlook as to which shall rule in education. The old has been with us for more than 2,000 years and is rooted in the philosophy and psychology of the ancient Greeks; the new began some 200 years ago, but has reached its clearest formulation within the past 50 years. It is rooted in modern inductive science and in the new philosophy brought into being mainly by democracy and the influence of Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

In the Revival of Learning the idea of book learning took on new life. Dean Colet, who in 1509 opened the first Renaissance school in England, thus stated the new scholarly interest in the preface of a little Latin grammar he wrote for this school: "Lerne gladly this lytel treatise, and commend it dylygently vnto your memoryes. Trustynge of this begynnying that ye shal procede and grow to parfyt literature, and come at last to be gret clarkes."

And this remains basically the educational conception of the literary humanist of today, namely, that to study and appreciate the best literature is in a peculiar sense and degree the proper aim of any full education. And this is so, they think, because in literature we have (adapting the words of I. A. Richards) "our best record of the experiences which have seemed worth having to the most sensitive and discriminating persons."

We might grant more of the claim for this particular kind of education if it suited a larger proportion of young people and if it did not tend so strongly to take those who do like it off into the ivory tower. But besides this weakness there is a further one to be found if the conception of learning assumed by this point of view is to apply to all of education. This theory of learning was precisely devised to fit book education. It starts with books (or lectures). It assumes that if the young will so "learn" what is thus given that they can give it back in recitation and examination, then they have available for use, at least measurably, the knowledge or wisdom or insight originally given.

This point of view, be it noted, sees man as predominantly, if not precisely, intellect; and its approach to the intellect is through memory. As Plutarch said, "Nothing doth so beget or nourish learning as memory . . . for this is, as it were, the storehouse of all learning." It was in accordance with this reliance on memory that the old-type "recitation" was in fact a reciting, a giving back in class of what had beforetimes been assigned for learning, and likewise the old-type examination was the kind that could be passed by suitable "cramming."

The essential features of the old-type education were, and are: (a) education is learning somebody else's knowledge or wisdom from textbooks or lectures; (b) such learning proceeds largely, if not entirely, by memory; (c) the test of successful learning is ability to restate in recitation or examination what has previously been given by textbook or lecture; (d) what is thus "learned" will appropriately act itself out in later life.

In strong contrast with this old stands the new. Its differentiating features are:

1. The act of learning is more than acquiring words, and more than acquiring ideas. A thing has not really been learned until it *can* and *will* manifest itself in later appropriate behavior.

2. Effective learning can come only from active living, from a living which uses what is to be learned as an essential part of that living. If then one is really to learn anything—be it a thought or a feeling (attitude) or a habit or a skill—if he is to learn it so well that he can be counted on to behave that way, his learning effort has to proceed by behaving that way, by behaving that way in his heart and behaving that way (so far as conditions allow) in his act.

There are other matters related to learning from the new point of view. Whatever significant thing one is doing, one may also be thinking and feeling about many other things that are connected with this; and one learns all of these attendant matters as he lives them. If a teacher scolds a boy for bad arithmetic, what happens will depend on the boy. If he likes arithmetic, he may

---

This is the third in a special series of articles with which the New Republic is celebrating its thirty-fifth anniversary by commenting on various aspects of Western civilization halfway through the twentieth century. The next in the series, by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, will deal with trade unionism.

William H. Kilpatrick, long an outstanding figure in American education, was for many years a professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. He holds earned degrees from Mercer and Columbia, was president of the Board of Trustees at Bennington College, and is the author of many books on education.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

determine not to fail this way again. If he feels insecure in arithmetic, he may resent the scolding. If so, he will likely think and feel (and learn) not only about being scolded, but also about the teacher for scolding him, about the other pupils who laugh at him, about himself as no good for school purposes, about arithmetic as a thing he is getting to hate, about school as another thing he is getting to hate.

Also many important learnings come, not all at once or even principally so, but *cumulatively*. "In time we hate that which we often fear." In this cumulative way we build perhaps the most important of all our learnings: attitudes, conceptions, ideals, standards, principles of action.

In the light of the whole foregoing discussion we seem compelled to conclude that

3. *The school must be primarily a place for living,* a place where good all-round living can go on in order that, by all-round behaving, all-round good character and personality may be built.

As we consider the preceding, we find the main differences between the old and new outlook to be the following:

¶ The old education was of books, to learn them to recite them; the new is of life and behaving, of life appropriate to the maturity of the child, of behaving by the child to shape his experience to his own recognized ends and purposes.

¶ The old aimed at learning what others had said in books; the new aims at character building, at a democratic self-direction which regards others, this to be progressively attained under teacher guidance.

¶ The old relied mainly on memory; the new relies on actual experience, on teacher-guided child experience and behaving, on teacher-approved purposeful activity on the part of the pupils.

¶ The old relied on repetition to fix the book content in memory; the new relies on active, interested living, on purposeful activity as wholehearted as can be got. For the stronger the purpose, the truer the quality of life and the stronger the resulting learning.

¶ The old thought, mistakenly, that only one learning was going on at one time, namely, the assigned lesson. The new knows that in each matter important to the pupil he has many simultaneous learnings in process all the waking time; that unwise treatment will probably generate bad attendant learnings; and wise treatment, good attendant learnings.

¶ The old type of school was, in intent, a place of motionless quiet, each child sitting at a screwed-down desk, "learning" his assigned lesson, with living as fully excluded as possible. The new is precisely a place for living—living and learning things fit and proper to be built into character. The aim of the new type of teacher is to obtain the best quality of living that he (or she) and the pupils can together contrive. Such living will often move outside the classroom, not simply to observe outside life, but even more to share in conducting its community enterprises. In such sharing are citizenship attitudes and knowledge both best built.

¶ The old school gave all its time to books. What about the new and its use of books? The new will use more books than the old and will use them better. The pupils of the new will learn more of book content and specifically will more surely grow to love books.

Does the new succeed in comparison with the old? The answer is yes, emphatically so. Every careful appraisal known to the writer substantiates the practical superiority of the new taken as one whole. The present new began in America, we may say, at Quincy, Massachusetts, in 1876 under Colonel Francis W. Parker. The conservatives of that day complained that the Quincy schools simply amused the children and made them happy, but did not teach the three R's. The State Board examined all the schools in the county; Quincy came out "far ahead" in everything except mental arithmetic. In 1923 Ellsworth Collings' rural school in Missouri surpassed the control schools in all subjects, his median being 138 percent of the control median, and 110.8 percent of the national median. In New York City, 70 schools with 50,000 pupils, after a six-year introductory trial of the activity program, were appraised by the New York State Department of Education: The "activity program" proved substantially as effective in the three R's, and superior in "developing skills in critical reading, elementary research technique, and in the development of civic attitudes and understanding of social relationships." On the showing made, the State Department of Education recommended (1942) the extension of the program throughout the city. G. D. Strayer found in his 1944 survey of the New York City schools that where "the activity program is well under way, overt acts of misbehavior seldom occur," "working morale of pupils is high" and "emotional conflicts and tensions have all but disappeared." But in most schools that do not have the activity program "these evils are still prevalent"—"in some of them alarmingly so."

At the present time it seems safe to assert that among those who have objectively studied the problem, the new has won its way for the elementary school. Unless they are interfered with from the outside, all American teachers' colleges more or less completely accept the theory of the new. It is true that we still hear assertions that in "progressive" schools pupils are allowed to "do as they please." Such statements the writer believes to be but caricatures. People report what they hear from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those who do not understand what they see; and the rumors spread.

It seems true to say that the typical college or secondary school in this country—but emphatically not all—still holds to the older point of view. And this is even truer of schools in most other countries. In the writer's opinion, it is a clear case of cultural lag.

Why does the secondary school lag behind the elementary school in this respect? The main reason is that secondary schools are now run practically everywhere on a departmentalized basis, each teacher, typically, caring for his subject—mathematics, English, Latin, or science, as the case may be. When such a teacher prepared for teaching, whether in the liberal-arts college or in a teachers' college, he majored in the subject he expected to teach. This means that he worked under a specialist in that subject, and generally for four years. Now ordinarily this professor had never studied "education" and often disbelieved in such study. The result is that many secondary-school teachers look askance at the 18 hours of education (out of 120) required by state departments.

In a word, some secondary-school teachers have profited by their work in education, some have not. Whichever it be, when they get to teaching in the high school, they find (again typically) the old point of view in fairly full control. Each teacher has his subject to teach and generally he must prepare his students for college. The result is that only the exceptional teacher can do more than bring some of the new into the old way of teaching. Three things thus concur to maintain the old outlook: custom or tradition; college entrance requirements (supposedly so); and the indoctrination of the high-school teachers by their college professors against the new point of view.

Why is the college so committed to the old outlook? The answer again is cultural lag, a clear case. Curious as it may seem, college professors are not prepared to *teach*. Their only preparation in the university is for *research*. The college, typically, requires the Ph.D. degree as a prerequisite. The Ph.D. is granted for research. Practically no "graduate school" in the United States raises a finger to teach education or to prepare specifically for college teaching. Preparation for research is *not* preparation for college teaching.

The secondary school is, to use an old, rustic term, now "hogtied" to the college as the college is hogtied to the graduate school. A proper study of education is not only not given to college teachers; it is practically denied to them. And the professor, whether in the liberal-arts college or in the teachers' college, passes his outmoded attitude on to those preparing to teach in the secondary school.

Is there nothing to be done? Yes, the quickest way, it appears, to bring in the new is to introduce it through the "core" work into the secondary school. The sixth-grade teacher is held responsible for teaching her eleven or twelve-year-olds the all-round education appropriate to that age. If I had my way, the seventh-grade teacher would the next year take these same thirty-odd pupils for three-fourths of the day, and teach them the all-round education appropriate to their age. The only difference betwen this year and last would be that the pupils are now a year older. This "all-round education" constitutes the core, and it should be conducted on the "activity" basis. In the eighth grade the core might take, not 75 percent of the day, but 70 percent, and so on up to the twelfth grade, when it would be 50 percent. During the rest of the day the pupil should study such subjects as he needs to meet his individual requirements: preparation for college, for vocational work, or for pursuing some interest more thoroughly than the core allows. Has this ever been tried? Yes, in greater or less degree, in many places. To make it succeed the teachers should major in "core work."

The discussion on learning given in connection with the elementary school holds equally for the secondary school. All learning must, to be effective, be on the life basis. Pupils must be self-active in what they do or their learning suffers; and they really learn anything only as that thing enters their own personal living and plays there a significant part in their own purposes. In this way they will put forth real effort; and they will learn in the degree that they give themselves to what they do. And, at the same time, in the degree that they give themselves wholeheartedly to what they do, in like measure will the attendant learnings be both sound (good) and strong. All of this holds equally for core and for departments; though it is often, perhaps generally, more difficult for the departmental teacher to work completely on the activity basis.

Has progressive education ever been tried in the secondary school? Yes, in many individual schools and to some extent in school systems. When tried, has it succeeded? In the only extensive study yet made, an affirmative answer was returned.

Some 15 years ago in the Eight Year Study (supported by grants of $70,000 from the Carnegie Corporation and more than $600,000 by the General Education Board) 30 experimental schools were chosen and some 200 colleges of the country agreed, during the course of the experiment, to take the recommendation of the school principal as to the fitness of the student for college entrance. This allowed the schools to experiment without fear of college entrance requirements.

After eight years, 1,475 graduates of these 30 schools had been graduated from recognized four-year colleges.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For each of these 1,475 there was chosen a comparee, measurably equal in all essential respects (age, sex, IQ, social status, kind of community, kind of family, etc.), the only difference being that the comparee had attended a traditional type of secondary school. These 30 schools were then arranged in the order of their divergence from the traditional type of school: at one end, the school that varied least; at the other end, the school that varied most; the others in between. Then the lowest six and the highest six were chosen for special study. The results were definite. Graduates of the schools that varied least from the traditional schools showed no appreciable differences from their comparees. But the graduates of those schools that varied most from the traditional type of secondary teaching showed: "consistently higher academic averages and more academic honors"; "clear-cut superiority in the intellectual intangibles of curiosity and drive, willingness and ability to think logically and objectively and active and vital interest in the world about them"; "they are more frequently concerned with democratic values and the importance of assuming their share of responsibility for the general welfare. They are more often coöperative, tolerant, and self-directing and less often purely personal or selfish in orientation." Q. E. D.

What about discipline? The problem of discipline is largely a hangover from the past. The old type of teacher often alienated his pupils by requiring work unsuited to them. This brought on antagonistic concomitant learnings, and the pupils tried to get even by making trouble. The teacher mistakenly thought to stop the trouble by threats and punishments. Such an effort to make refractory pupils behave is what teachers of the old type call discipline; and many parents who think and act in similar fashion with their own children agree with them.

What the new type of school does was implied in the quotations given above from Professor Strayer. Where the teaching is adjusted to the pupils, they develop strong interest in their work and build friendly and coöperative attitudes toward the teacher. It is under such circumstances that the problem of discipline disappears.

What we really wish here is character, the active presence of certain character traits: sensitivity to the effect of one's acts on oneself and on others; the habit of acting on thinking, and not on mere impulse; the will to persist in an intelligently chosen course of action in spite of difficulties and hindrances. The old outlook mistakenly identified discipline with coercion and punishment. This seldom brings desirable character traits; more often the contrary.

How does one build good character traits? The answer seems clear: when the young act under such guidance of parents or teacher as, on the one hand, gives a sense of sympathetic security and, on the other, leads to the interested pursuit of purposes felt by the child as his own, good character traits are probable. In the school class, group discussion under sympathetic guidance leads easily to the choice of group purposes which are both educatively wise and personally acceptable to the group.

There are many signs that the liberal-arts college is trying to wake up. So far, however, its efforts have been directed mainly within the old tradition. But there is every reason to believe that the considerations which have remade the theory of elementary education and are now trying to remake the secondary school apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the liberal-arts college. If the best now known in education could be put to work in our colleges, there would be a mighty shaking among the dry bones. The hope lies in the better education of college teachers and administrators. And the best present hope for this seems to lie in persuading one of our foremost universities to start a new type of graduate school to prepare college teachers. Research is a great resource to any civilization, but, taken alone, it constitutes a most inadequate preparation for college teaching.

As to the social-moral aims of education, two groups deal inadequately with these: first, those who ignore behaving as a necessary factor in learning and use books instead (this includes many recent ambitious programs for "general education," "contemporary civilization," and the like); second, those who overstress vocational preparation, giving "cultural" subjects only a "lick and a promise."

The world situation is too critical for such inadequate measures. Youth must be reared from childhood to grapple with life's problems at each developing level. This means constructive discussion to plan school work; it means building attitudes of concern for the common good (as increasingly perceived); it means attacking controversial issues (within the growing intellectual reach); it means pursuing social purposes into the community. In these various ways must each youth build effective citizenship.

In view of the foregoing, the specific tasks confronting American education seem to be: (a) remake the elementary school consistently on the new outlook which it now professes; (b) rebuild the secondary school on the basis of living and learning: dethrone memory and cramming for examinations; abolish the subservience to entrance examinations and college entrance requirements; put the high school on a basis of the finest and richest living that teachers and pupils can together devise; (c) so rebuild the college as to get true living (behaving) into its program; educate its instructors for full, true teaching; bring the thinking of teaching and management abreast of the best that is known.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *Farley Would If He Dared*

THE BRITISH ELECTIONS have had some curious repercussions in this country. Consider Governor Thomas E. Dewey. After he had recovered his voice somewhat following the terrific jolt administered to him as the "Me too, only me-er" candidate for President in 1948, he said, on at least two occasions, that he would not again seek the Presidency. This, despite the fact that he undoubtedly was at a loss to understand why the voters so cavalierly turned down an opportunity to vote for such an exceptional person.

But it is as true as it ever was that when a man has once been stung by the Presidential bee, he never fully recovers. I do not pretend to be a reader of anyone's thoughts, especially such astute ones as those in which Governor Dewey indulges. Yet, I venture to guess that it has occurred to him, as it probably has to some of his friends, that if Winston Churchill could lose for the second time, by about the same percentage of the total vote as that by which Dewey lost in 1948, and still be one of the principal contenders for Prime Minister, there is no reason why Dewey should not make another attempt to scale the walls of the White House. So, notwithstanding what Mr. Dewey or his friends may have said by way of disclaimer as to his running again in 1952, I suspect that he will give the people a chance to forget that he ever committed what he has probably come to regard as an indiscretion.

There can hardly be a doubt that Mr. Dewey will be a candidate for Governor this year. If he wins, which he is likely to do, considering how broken the Democratic gubernatorial field is in New York, he will name the Republican delegates to the next National Convention. If this powerful delegation and others raise the Dewey standard and undertake again to nominate the Twice-Defeated One as their candidate for President, who would expect him to be so ungracious as not to be willing to make a third sacrifice hit?

The politicians, as well as most "observers," concede that as a candidate for Governor this year Dewey would be difficult to defeat. A great many New Yorkers believe that he has been a first-rate administrator who has done a good job at Albany. Furthermore, the Republicans can unite behind Dewey for Governor, even if without enthusiasm.

In 1942, Dewey had James A. Farley to thank for forcing on the Democrats as their choice for Governor John J. Bennett, a man who had no chance to win. In very truth it was the dog-in-the-manger tactics of Farley, in preventing the nomination for Governor of Senator Mead, which handed the election to Dewey.

It has been reported that Dewey has come to feel differently about the Catholic vote—which is important in New York—than he did the first time that he ran. Then, he believed that he could win even if the rest of the GOP nominees were Chinamen. This year, instead of relying negatively upon a split Catholic Democratic vote, as he did in 1942, Mr. Dewey is said to believe that his chances to win would be enhanced if the Republican candidate for Senator were an outstanding Catholic. He is thought by some to be considering for the Senatorial nomination "Wild Bill" Donovan, of Buffalo, whom he hates, and who hates him. But Donovan has long wanted to be a Senator and, in view of the ineffectual campaign waged last year by that "greatest statesman in the world," John Foster Dulles, against Herbert Lehman, it would not be surprising if Dewey should dump Dulles at this point and face the newspaper cameras with a dazzling smile, while holding General Donovan in a happy embrace.

On the Democratic side, James A. Farley once again thinks that he thinks that he might be a candidate. He has been encouraged so to regard himself by those who have been trying to prevent Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. from stampeding his party as he stampeded the voters in his Congressional District when he ran for the House of Representatives. When young Roosevelt ran to fill the Bloom vacancy, he made the mistake of soliciting the support of the eminent Coca-Cola statesman; Farley turned him down cold. It is not known whether FDR Jr. intends to enter for Governor. Some of his sincere friends hope that he will first build up a record. There can be no doubt that Paul Fitzpatrick, of Buffalo, Democratic state chairman, would like to go to Albany to pitch for the railroads and the utilities.

There are also those on the Democratic side who would like to see Judge Charles W. Froessel, of Queens, the party candidate for Governor. He ran well ahead of Lehman last year as a candidate to fill a vacancy on the Court of Appeals. He and Lehman would make a strong combination and it would take such a ticket to defeat Dewey and a man like Donovan.

On other occasions in the past Jim Farley has imagined himself a candidate for Governor, but at the showdown he has always been fearful that he could not win. He could hardly hope to beat Dewey. If I were a betting man, I would be willing to wager that, however this spavined old political warhorse may be feeling at the moment, his customary defeatism will recur so that, sooner or later, he will prudently decide that he had better fly to France to look after the Coca-Cola trade in that benighted country. HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

BURNHAM'S WAR ON THE SOVIETS

by David Spitz

DESPITE A SUCCESSION of political allegiances—from Marxism to managerial society, to elite rule based on force and fraud, to the great-man theory curiously embodied in General de Gaulle—James Burnham has always retained the comfort of certainty. He is always convinced he is right, although almost always proved wrong.

Such assurance is a logical extension of the language of inevitability. Burnham thinks in imperatives, in terms of what *must* rather than what *ought* to be. He thinks also in extremes, in black-and-white categories that leave no room for compromise or the accommodation of inconvenient details. There is doubtless a terrible fascination in simplicity, in having to confront only a single pair of absolutes unfettered by qualifications. But history rarely presents so uncomplicated a choice. Always there is a middle ground, always differences of degree that blend subtly into differences of kind. Man is a complex animal, and his politics reflects that complexity.

THE COMING DEFEAT OF COMMUNISM, by James Burnham (John Day; $3.50).

For Burnham, however, the pattern is clear. It is "we" or "they," and "they" are the Communists. This book, like his earlier *Struggle for the World*, is a plea and a plan for the destruction of the power of Soviet-based Communism.

Possessed by the conviction that the Soviet Union is committed to world domination, Burnham avers that it has already begun to seek and to achieve the fulfilment of that purpose, and that the survival of the Western world depends both upon halting and eliminating Soviet expansion and power. This, he holds, can be accomplished ultimately only by war. Sentimentalists who urge less unpleasant ways of resolving the problem forget that the cold war is itself a war, that the very line of demarcation between "peace" and "war" has now disappeared. The Russians understand and respond to this; they move and are moved only by force. Consequently, he argues, the United States, as the only power strong enough to apply force against the Soviet Union, must lead the attack on the Communists.

What is the strategy of this attack? Within the democracies, Burnham says, we must outlaw the Communist Parties and deny their members freedom of speech. They are traitors, and deserve no civil rights. We should organize exiles and refugees who have fled Communism and cultivate our political friends—not those who are anti-Communist only in words but those who, like the Catholic Church and de Gaulle, will back their convictions by deeds, will fight, if necessary, to the death. Burnham would have us send money and guns to build Resistance movements throughout Europe, and select the weakest of the Soviet satellites for the counter-offensive of actual penetration. Albania, especially susceptible, is suggested as a good first.

Russia, of course, may fight, but Burnham does not think this probable. The Soviet leaders, he is confident, know that resistance would result in their defeat and would consequently withdraw; our victory would come almost by default. This process, intensified by economic pressures and the power of propaganda, should be repeated until Europe is free. The final coup, to destroy Communism within Russia's borders, would be accomplished by political-subversive warfare, including a deal offered the underground within Russia to encourage internal revolution. If all this should fail, there is still the decisive tactic of total war. Inevitably, Burnham is convinced, Communism will be defeated.

If one can ignore the unproved assumptions, the exaggerations and inconsistencies, and the vilification of persons (whose ideas Burnham once even more dogmatically affirmed), there emerges from this book a not implausible theme, persuasively argued. Burnham writes clearly and incisively, and there are flashes of real understanding. But his basic thesis ignores human values and sets prejudice above fact.

Burnham dismisses the United Nations as a place "where nothing is or can be decided. . . . If I want war and you want peace, what is there for us to confer about?" But Soviet troops were withdrawn from Iran, and British and French troops from Syria, when these disputes were brought to the Security Council; here conference succeeded in subordinating force to reason. To the extent that the weakness of the UN hinders its effectiveness, the proper alternative is not to abandon but to strengthen it. From another standpoint, however, the UN is not weak but strong; for in a divided world unready for a single government, what is essential is a forum for the exchange of ideas rather than bullets.

Burnham confuses the fight against Communism with the fight against the Soviet Union. These are not the same. Communism does not exist because of the Soviet Union; the Soviet Union exists because of Communism. Like those who would eliminate illness by killing the diseased, Burnham ignores the conditions—economic insecurity, political inequality, social injustice, and the like—that make for totalitarian Communism. This is because he is not against Communism but against Soviet Communism. For those of us who reject both, the Third Force presents a nobler and more effective answer. The defeat of Hitler and Mussolini did not destroy their doctrines. Simply to defeat the Soviet Union is not to destroy Communism.

Burnham is an authoritarian who would employ the totalitarian tactics of the enemy. Not only would he outlaw Communism, which would do no more than drive its followers underground; he would not hesitate to use deception and terror or to coöperate with fascists and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other dubious opponents of Stalinism. For him expediency, not principle, is the only test. But democrats who would escape being shot by Communists are not likely to find more comfort in being hanged by fascists. To overthrow the governments of the satellite countries, for example, is to raise, not to resolve, the question of replacement. This becomes crucial when we realize that Burnham's phrase, "a democratic world order," is no more than a disguise for "American empire."

In his devotion to human freedom and the processes of reason, James Burnham leaves everything to be desired. Lacking humility, he lacks even more a true sense of human dignity and the worth of human life. He thinks, and talks, fundamentally, of abstract forces and imperatives, of iron laws of politics, of fears and hatreds. Democrats who would defeat Communism and retain democracy will do well to pursue other paths than Burnham's philosophy of inevitability and despair.

David Spitz, assistant professor of Political Science at Ohio State University, is author of Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought, published last spring by Macmillan.

WHO RUNS THE SOUTH?

SOUTHERN POLITICS, by V. O. Key Jr., with the assistance of Alexander Heard (Alfred A. Knopf; $6).

SOUTHERN LEGACY, by Hodding Carter (Louisiana State University Press; $3).

V. O. KEY JR., a young Texas political scientist, recently appointed Alfred Cowles Professor of Government at Yale University, has produced an analysis of present-day Southern politics which is sure to enlighten even the best-informed natives about their region and should set the pattern for a valuable succession of similar studies of "Midwest Politics," "Pacific Coast Politics" and the like.

Professor Key, his chief assistant Alexander Heard, and a sizable staff spent three years interviewing more than 500 Southerners and conducting field investigations in 11 states. The fact that the work for this volume was done through the University of Alabama on funds supplied by the Rockefeller Foundation has not prevented Key from approaching some very "touchy" subjects in forthright manner or from making clear the radical nature of the problem which Southern politics poses for the whole nation.

It is Key's fundamental thesis that the one-party system, built on "the position of the Negro" and "the role of the black belts," will continue to throttle the South so long as these two factors remain roughly what they are today. "The hard core of the political South," he contends, "is made up of those counties and sections of the Southern states in which Negroes constitute a substantial portion of the population" (later defined as greater than 50 percent). He goes on:

> [These] black belts make up only a small part of the area of the South and account for an even smaller part of the white population of the South. Yet if the politics of the South revolves around any single theme, it is that of the role of the black belts. Although the whites of the black belts are few in number, their unity and their political skill have enabled them to run a shoestring into decisive power at critical junctures in Southern political history.

This relatively small minority "persuaded the entire South that it should fight to protect slave property," put down the Populist revolt among the poorer whites in the nineties, and "in the disillusionment brought about by Populist defeat were able to recruit enough upcountry support to adopt poll taxes, literacy tests, and other instruments to disfranchise the Negro. . . . Two-party competition would have been fatal to the status of black-belt whites . . . would have meant an appeal to the Negro vote and . . . Negro rule in some black-belt counties." The emergence of any substantial alternative to the Democratic Party might have affected the "destruction of Southern solidarity in national politics" and weakened the region's ability "to resist any national move toward interference with Southern authority to deal with the race question."

The critical element in the structure of black-belt powers [therefore] has been the Southern Senator and his actual, if not formal, right to veto proposals of intervention to protect Negro rights. . . . The black belts have had nothing to fear from state governments . . . only the Federal Government was to be feared.

From this basic viewpoint, Key examines one-party politics as it is practised in each of the 11 states of the one-time Confederacy. In absorbing detail he reveals the forces that produce the comic-opera character which outsiders accept as the real leaders—the Planters, the Populists, the "Big Mules" and "Kissin' Jim" Folsom; the Rednecks, the Delta and the late Senator Bilbo; the Civil War and Boss Crump. He moves on to examine the effect of the one-party system on the politics of the nation, to explain the Dixiecrats and to assess the influence over the years of block-voting in Congress.

And finally, Key turns to consider —too briefly for me—a "Way Out." "Fundamental shifts are taking place . . . decline in the Negro population, the growth of cities, and the dilution of [the] agricultural economy by the rise of industry and trade." But these things "occur only slowly" and do not "automatically bring political change. They only create conditions favorable to change which must be wrought by men and women disposed to take advantage of the opportunity to accelerate the inevitable. . . . Until greater emancipation of the white from the Negro is

The Most Controversial Issue of the 1950's!

POINT FOUR

- What political, economic and social forces rock two-thirds of the world's people?
- What effects will a really *Bold New Program* have on their lives?
- How can the United Nations be strengthened in the process?
- What does the new program mean to us and our economy?
- What are the chances for world peace and democracy?

Know the answers to the above vital questions! Read the **BOLD NEW PROGRAM** a series of eight pamphlets, by prominent authorities.

■ **$2.50—over 600 pages—order from:**

DR. DEWEY ANDERSON, *Director*

PUBLIC AFFAIRS INSTITUTE

312 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., S.E.

WASHINGTON 3, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

achieved, the Southern political and economic system will labor under formidable handicaps. The race issue . . . must be considered as the number one problem on the Southern agenda. Lacking a solution for it, all else fails."

The contribution Key has made in this book is so rich that it is probably ungenerous to criticize him for failing to address himself to solutions for the problems he has described.

Hodding Carter was 43 the day his latest volume on the South appeared, but *Southern Legacy* is an old man's book. The "independent, liberal" editor of the *Delta Democrat-Times* has written a perceptive and often witty essay on life in Washington County, Mississippi. Carter is neither deaf nor blind to the life around him, but clearly it will be a long time before there is marked improvement in the South if we must wait for the Hodding Carters to do the job.

Southern Legacy is in the style of a great gentleman of the last generation, Will Percy, also of Washington County, Mississippi, upon whom Carter apparently models himself as well as his writing. Typical of the best of the old Delta aristocracy, the Percys lived for generations by a tradition of honor, dignity and fair-dealing. It was Will Percy who made it possible for the young Louisianan, Hodding Carter, to buy the Greenville newspaper and settle in the town during the depression. This book reflects the spirit of Will Percy. With good-humored candor, it tries to explain, so that even Yankees can understand, how black-belt white men feel about their wives and grandmothers, the Negro friends who grew up with them, the po' whites, the few foreigners who have drifted in, religion, physical courage, and Northerners who try to tell them what to do. Transplanted Southerners who have tried so often to do the same thing will best recognize how soundly he expounds on these familiar subjects.

On the key issue of the position of the Negro, however, Carter's nineteenth-century approach falls considerably short of what the times require. He favors "education, greater economic security, and protective legislation" to "soften the impact of racial antipathies." "But there is no formula for ending them except the formula which man discovers within himself." For the foreseeable future, he adds, "I believe that Savannah, Georgia, is an example of almost all the Negro wants now to attain or can now attain as a citizen of the South. . . . The police force includes twelve Negroes and the post-office employs fifty-four Negro mail carriers."

To some, that will seem scarcely enough. HELEN FULLER

SOVIET SURREALIST

BORIS PASTERNAK: SELECTED WRITINGS. (New Directions; $1.50).

BORIS PASTERNAK, by all odds the most important living Russian poet, occupies a somewhat special and isolated position in Soviet literature. Poetry in the USSR is today highly functional: it has to fit the general pattern of politically conscious, educational and didactic art. It is addressed to the masses and uses deliberately simple forms, including the old-fashioned realistic narrative in verse. Pasternak refuses to follow this designated way. "Art is concerned not with man but with the image of man," he has asserted. "The image of man, as it becomes apparent, is greater than man. . . . Focused on a reality which feeling has displaced, art is a record of this displacement." Pasternak does not venture on political rhetoric, does not reflect the events of his times, does not comment on social changes brought about by the Revolution. Intent on his inner world, he projects it through unusual associations of images in lyrics which blend sophistication with rare verbal perfection.

The intellectual depth and emotional intensity of his work, and the exceptionally subjective—at times bizarre—slant with which he contemplates objects, ideas and emotions, make him a poet's poet. Communist critics reproach him for his aloofness from the problems of the epoch and his art-for-art's-sake attitude. He has, they maintain, alienated himself from the masses, and they censure him for cultivating what they term the decadent formalism of the bourgeois West. Although the literary antecedents of this Soviet surrealist may be easily traced back to the Russian Symbolists and Futurists of 1910-22, Pasternak belongs to the same major movement as Eliot, Auden or Eluard, a movement called Modern Poetry in Europe and America.

In presenting Pasternak to the American reader through these selections from the two-volume edition published by Lindsay Drummond in London, New Directions has made a commendable effort. Unfortunately, Pasternak's closely woven fabric of symbols and the musical dynamism of his lines defy translation (at least at the present hands), and the versions offered in the book fall far short of the original. The prose, however, is rendered more adequately, and one cannot fail to admire Pasternak's autobiographical sketches, dealing with his life and studies of philosophy in Germany, his meetings with Scriabin, and his impressions upon the death of Mayakovsky. These glimpses of the development of Pasternak's poetic imagination and sensitivity are conveyed in a highly suggestive style of metaphors and emotional intimations. The "Aerial Ways" and that beautiful story, "The Childhood of Luvers," are variations on the one theme which runs like a leitmotif through the works of this extraordinary poet and constitutes his main concern: the birth and growth of the creative process as man's greatest mystery and highest achievement. MARC SLONIM

Marc Slonim, who teaches literature at Sarah Lawrence College, is the author of The Epic of Russian Literature, which was published in January by the Oxford University Press.

MEASURE OF A POET

THE PERMANENCE OF YEATS: SELECTED CRITICISM. Edited by James Hall and Martin Steinmann (Macmillan; $5).

YEATS NOW HAS his symposium, as Eliot has recently had three. With Eliot it was easier: there were so many sources to track down, critical pronouncements to follow up, stands to be taken on Christianity, classicism, tradition. With Yeats the hardest job is to see where Yeats himself is standing. What did he believe? What shall be done with that outrageous book, *A Vision*? How relate it to his art, and his life to his art?

Yeats has now achieved "permanence"; his critics, as yet, have not. Like all such anthologies (and this book represents the best critics now writing), the result may bewilder a reader who doesn't know the subject in advance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hardly a statement escapes negation by some other critic. The attempt to give proper significance to Yeats's diverse interests—folklore, politics, spiritualism, Celtic mythology, symbolism, theatre, magic, women—sounds like a debate at the foot of the Tower of Babel and leaves Yeats where he has always been, larger and taller than those who talk about him. His "permanence" is best attested by the fact that the sympathetic essays in this book are the most profound, while the unfriendly and disciplinary criticism tends to show up the writers rather than Yeats.

By this time criticism of Yeats's poetry has its own tradition. In perspective, it is evident that as long ago as 1931 Edmund Wilson performed a brilliant job, the best he has done on a poet. About half of this volume puts between covers the remarkable 1942 winter issue of the *Southern Review* which was exclusively devoted to Yeats. Excerpts from books not focused on Yeats exclusively—Daiches, Tindall, Beach, Leavis—allow us to orient his achievement. Readers who want him illuminated by special spotlights may read Blackmur, Ransom, Tate, Houghton, Austin Warren, Bentley. And those who prefer feet of clay, a creature more mire and blood, may turn to Middleton Murry and D. S. Savage. Eliot's tribute stands out as a commemorative lecture "to the memory of a great poet," while Morton Dauwen Zabel's excelling piece comes closest to the central secrets and powers of Yeats. Occasionally a later essay will correct an earlier mistake, as A. Norman Jeffares does for an unsupported interpretation by Delmore Schwartz.

James Hall and Martin Steinmann, the editors, have furnished a useful select bibliography and a preface that defends Yeats's "secret discipline" by arguing that it is based on history and anthropology and translates private into traditional or easily accessible symbols.

Gradually, some assent seems to arise from the separate voices: that Yeats was independent, aristocratic, mentally energetic, a master of poetic speech and form, romantic in temperament, heroic, for our time the most valiant antagonist of scientific materialism, one of those few "who are a part of the consciousness of an age which cannot be understood without them." The power of his mind, its elusive poetic power, may be shown in the phenomenon that it fascinates its critics toward antithetical conclusions: when young, Yeats had taken Hamlet as his mask. Yeats has said that poetry is made out of our quarrel with ourselves. Perhaps the permanence of a great poet finally results from the quarrels among his critics, refereed by anthologists, and judged by posterity (unlike prizefights) many years after the altercations are over.

DONALD A. STAUFFER

Donald A. Stauffer, chairman of the Department of English at Princeton University, is the author, among other books, of The Nature of Poetry, The Golden Nightingale *and* Shakespeare's World of Images.

MUSIC: Midseason Miscellany

TOWARD THE END of his second season in the US, Victor de Sabata finally introduced himself to New York in the first concerts of a four-week term as guest conductor of the Philharmonic-Symphony. A double-threat man with a great European reputation as a virtuoso director of both opera and symphonic music, the Italian conductor's concerts in Pittsburgh, Chicago and Philadelphia, from all reports, had been spellbinding affairs. The Philharmonic audience, expecting Roman candles and skyrockets, heard only the sputtering of damp firecrackers.

It was hard to understand quite why the display did not come off. All the makings were there. Except for a couple of pallid Italian novelties by Orazio Frazzi and Giorgio Federico Ghedini, which could be condoned as patriotic gestures, de Sabata's first two programs contained nothing but rabble-rousers—Rossini's Overture to "La Gazza Ladra," Berlioz's "Fantastic Symphony," Sibelius' First Symphony, Wagner's "Ride of the Valkyries" and Ravel's "Bolero" among them. His platform presence was commanding, a performance of carefully designed choreographic

The History behind the News!

The Decline and Fall of British Capitalism

Do the dramatic Conservative gains foreshadow the revival of capitalism in Britain? No, says Keith Hutchison, and 70 years of British history back him in his conclusion.

He shows how, since 1880, private capital has ducked, side-stepped, counter-attacked—yet consistently given ground before the advance of Labor. He demonstrates clearly that Labor has become too potent a force to be halted permanently in its march towards socialism.

Objective, carefully reasoned and documented, this book offers enlightenment to everyone interested in British economic affairs... and to Americans who are concerned about the fate of our own capitalist system.

$3.50 at bookstores everywhere

by KEITH HUTCHISON
Financial Editor of THE NATION

SCRIBNERS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movements, which verged upon Dionysiac abandon in the "Bolero." Every piece ended with a roar, and the audience applauded vociferously. But in the course of the various compositions it was impossible to discern results that any competent, and outwardly less pretentious, conductor might not have attained. For so much extra work, there should have been extra excitement. De Sabata seemed happy, however. A past master at milking an audience, he clasped his hands over his heart, embraced his hearers from a distance, and came back on stage so often and stayed so long that there was not enough applause left to cover his final exit.

Ljuba Welitch. Last season the Bulgarian soprano's theatrical and vocal projection in the title role of Strauss's "Salome," which won her 16 curtain calls at her debut, was the most electric event of the Metropolitan Opera year. This season she has sung Salome only twice, and the focus of attention has shifted to her other roles. A good many people are beginning to wonder whether she is a one-opera prima donna. As Donna Anna in Mozart's "Don Giovanni" her singing was far from flawless, especially in the coloratura passages, and she substituted languishing pose for valid character development. As Floria Tosca, she pushed melodrama toward the border of burlesque, giving Lawrence Tibbett, as Scarpia, the battle of the century, kicking his lifeless body viciously after she had repeatedly stabbed him, and in general offering a tastelessly overdrawn performance. As Aida, she sang Verdi's soaring music hastily, inaccurately, with a single, monotonous tone color, and, except for occasional vivid moments, reverted to superficial posturing instead of the richly detailed acting of which her Salome proves her capable. As yet she shows no signs of losing her public, but she soon will if she does not develop a stronger sense of artistic responsibility. That would be unfortunate, for no operatic soprano in recent years has seized the public fancy more forcefully at the outset.

Leonard Bernstein. In the course of a two-week stretch in charge of the Philharmonic-Symphony, the 30-year-old American conductor gave a remarkably complete accounting of his present assets and demerits. His second symphony, "The Age of Anxiety: A Baroque Eclogue (after W. H. Auden)," marked out clearly his range as a composer. Inspired by, but not slavishly subservient to, Auden's poem about three jaded moderns in search of the meaning of life on Third Avenue, the symphony contains a brilliant scherzo in idealized Broadway rhythms (in which the tricky solo piano part was dashed off superbly by Lukas Foss), a set of 14 rather academic and studied variations, and some thoughtful sections that tend to trade in clichés. His performance of Beethoven's C minor Piano Concerto, conducting from the keyboard, demonstrated that full-time pianists are able to keep their technique in better shape, and that concertos go better when the functions of soloist and conductor are divided. His interpretations of Aaron Copland's "Outdoor Overture" and the slow movement of Harold Shapero's "Symphony for Classical Orchestra" again proved him an unsurpassed advocate of the music of his American contemporaries. His treatment of Beethoven's Eighth Symphony was an attempt to oversell himself as a baton virtuoso; it was hysterical, misshapen, thoughtlessly planned, and coarse and strained in sound. The trouble with Bernstein is that you cannot depend on him to use his best abilities or to retain reasonable self-command. When he is good he is very good; when he is bad he is haywire.

Charles Munch. There is a provocative parallel between Bernstein and the new conductor of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. Munch lacks Serge Koussevitzky's cool ability to know where he is and what the orchestra is doing every moment of the time. He lets himself be swept away by the orgiastic excitement of conducting, enticing his men into uncontrolled, rough playing that bears little resemblance to the suave, exquisitely balanced sounds they used to make for Koussevitzky. Yet on occasion, as in a recent performance of Schumann's Fourth Symphony, he is capable of a sane, essentially serene interpretation that is quite moving. Perhaps he is still ill at ease, and will relax later on. After all, it is no easy assignment to carry on after Koussevitzky's princely quarter-century.

CECIL SMITH

STAGE PLAY

"Perfectly Wrought Drama"—Atkinson, Times

THE INNOCENTS

Based on Henry James' "The Turn of the Screw"

with BEATRICE STRAIGHT

PLAYHOUSE, 48th St. E. of B'way. Mats. Wed. & Sat.

MOVIES: Run of the Mill

THE SCREEN VERSION of *Three Came Home*, Agnes Newton Keith's account of her experiences as a prisoner of the Japanese, is unconvincing and rather apathetic. The fault lies partly in an inexpert scenario, partly in Claudette Colbert's performance as the heroine. The picture is constructed as a series of "telling incidents"; it is a method commonly adopted by journalists and others who have unusual experiences to recount, but as a dramatic method it has the effect of repeatedly checking the action and damping the spectator's emotional participation. In this case, furthermore, the episodes are framed a little too neatly: they give the impression that Mrs. Keith's experiences behind the barbed wire were planned in advance to fit the scheme of a forthcoming best-seller. "Three Came Home" also suffers from the kind of writing in which fresh misfortune is foreshadowed by a violent thunder storm, and the naïve utterances of children underscore their parents' terrors.

Miss Colbert's handling of the principal role does nothing to overcome these difficulties. Her anxieties and sufferings are products of grease paint and prompting. Nothing about her attitudes or actions suggests a woman reduced to the elements of survival, and in her moments of greatest trial she communicates a distress that is scarcely more harrowing than the temporary malaise of a suburban matron who has gardened too long in the sun. The supporting

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actresses, particularly Florence Desmond and Sylvia Andrew, are much better in this respect. They create a mood of exhausted resiliency, a kind of tough second wind, that blots out Miss Colbert's attack of migraine.

Sessue Hayakawa, as the prison commandant, struggles with the task of being at once an inscrutable Oriental despot and a humane gentleman eager to show Miss Colbert every courtesy. His part is too sketchy to permit him more than a surface and visual plausibility, but this he conveys with remarkable dexterity. The extras and bit players who appear as Japanese soldiers are skillfully directed: their sloppy, uneasy bullying seems incalculably menacing and gives overtones of potential horror to a picture in which nothing very terrible takes place.

The useful life of a professional entertainer is longer than that of a professional ballplayer, but even so the years work changes that makeup and cross lighting and the most cunning of tailors cannot obliterate indefinitely. There comes a day when the young blade must change his manner or retire from view. If he does neither, he embarrasses his friends and evokes cruel laughter from his juniors. Thus, Maurice Chevalier, now to be seen in "A Royal Affair."

This new import, in which Chevalier plays an amorous kingling on Paris holiday, is a loose-lipped travesty of witty naughtiness. The French claim with some justice to be the most stylish of peoples, but when their sense of taste and elegance deserts them it goes completely and they produce work of excruciating tackiness. "A Royal Affair" is perhaps the most trying example of Gallic vulgarity since the French Pavilion at the World's Fair.

Nevertheless, the young Chevalier would not have been defeated by such trash. He would have tilted his hat over one eye, stuck a cane under his elbow and ogled his way through roars of applause. Now he lets himself be involved in the witless script and his scattered attempts to "make like Chevalier" are mirthless and leaden. The forced roguishness, the calculated spryness, the ardor turned lechery, make him seem much older than he is. Chevalier is one of the most knowing showmen alive and in "Man About Town," a René Clair picture seen here in 1947, he showed a gift for straight comedy that could keep him profitably occupied for years. But he should stop trying to compete in the hundred-yard dash for the bedroom.

The Italian "Mafia," filmed in Sicily, contains some beautifully arid scenery. The landscape is not unlike sections of the American West, but on a smaller scale and more bitter. Unfortunately, the story is also not unlike a cut-rate Western. A young judge (he doubles as sheriff), arriving in a frontier town to dispense justice, immediately finds himself caught in a crossfire between the vigilante Mafia and the local banditti.

The baron in residence is smoothly villainous, the baroness is the prettiest, most golden-hearted girl in the whole dam' state of Texas. Our hero is not only beleaguered; he is owlishly in love. The show winds up suddenly, but not unexpectedly, when the noble old boss of the Mafia decides that the judge is a fine boy and dead right on the subject of due process. The acting is better than average, but not good enough to make any real difference.

When the Mafia emigrated to New York it became the Black Hand, a gangster set-up, pure and simple. M-G-M's "Black Hand" is a rousing melodrama, with a number of loose strings and some outrageously unlikely details, but put together with enough style and run off at sufficient speed to make excellent entertainment.

Gene Kelly plays a young Italian American bent on avenging his father, who died with a Mafia knife in his back; he turns in a virtuoso performance, just extravagant enough and carried off with the harsh grace that distinguishes his dancing. J. Carroll Naish, as an Italian-born detective, is an excellent solid foil for Kelly's dramatics. The rest of the cast has been shrewdly picked and polished until it sparkles. Richard Thorpe, the director, has produced a commercial picture with no pretensions to being anything more. At that level, it is first-rate.

ROBERT HATCH

Printed by STEINBERG PRESS, INC., Morgan & Johnson Aves., Brooklyn 6, N. Y. 173

RESORTS

MAMANASCO Lake Lodge
Ridgefield, Conn. • Phone 820
Delightful Winter Weekends and vacations. Skating mile-long lake. Skiing 1000-foot slope and tow. Varied indoor diversions. Television. Excellent cuisine and accommodations. Wood-burning fireplaces. Very attractive rates.

ARROWHEAD LODGE
FOR YOUR EASTER VACATION

All seasonal sports • Arts and Crafts • Fireplaces • Dancing Recording Library, Entertainment • Reasonable Rates.
RESERVE NOW!
ELLENVILLE, N. Y. Ellenville 502
City phone: GR 7-1267

BOOKS

Now Ready . . . . . .
ROSY CROSS
(Reprint)
Who are the Rosicrucians?
Tells how easy it is to become a Rosicrucian and how to recognize one.
Genuine Rosicruciana
Order direct from the Publishers
$3.00 per copy
THE GUARDSMAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
Box 333, Kitchener, Ontario, Canada.

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 86 Radio City, New York.

LITERARY SERVICES

WRITERS—Efficient sales service for your books, short stories, articles plays. Free booklet. Write today! Daniel S. Mead Literary Agency, 419 4th Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

TYPING

MANUSCRIPT TYPING. We specialize in typing doctors' and masters' theses. Intelligent and accurate performance. Ambassador Office Service, 17 East 48th St., PLaza 3-1364.

MAGAZINE

NOW AVAILABLE from BELGRADE!
YUGOSLAV FORTNIGHTLY
A COMPLETE NEWSPAPER
(English Language Edition)
With up-to-the-minute information on political, economic and cultural developments in New Yugoslavia. Semi-monthly.
SUBSCRIPTION — $2.00 YEARLY
Bookseller's Discount.
Order from DEPARTMENT R-4
YUGOSLAV INFORMATION CENTER
36 Central Park South, N. Y. C. 19

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

She knows what your giving means

Helping turn on the light of hope in some disaster-stricken face . . .

That's what your giving means.

Helping to save a life so dear to someone, somewhere . . .

That's what your giving means.

Your help is always there—through your Red Cross. Know in your heart you sent your share.

Give now and give generously.

All may help through

RED CROSS

GIVE NOW!

Contributed by The NEW REPUBLIC in cooperation with the Red Cross

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED